

2.0 Submitted Comments, Documents, and Transcripts

Comments Submitted by E-Mail

E-0001

Moore, Nadia (Hope) A

From: ^Solid Waste EIS - DOE
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2003 1:11 PM
To: Abrams, Cynthia; Moore, Nadia (Hope) A; Schmidt, Shanna D
Cc: Shipler, Dillard B; Rhoads, Kathleen
Subject: FW: please stop

-----Original Message-----

From: KrissyD [mailto:KrissyD@Documounts.com]
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 6:00 PM
To: hswels@rl.gov
Subject: please stop

Dear Mr Collins,

1

Please stop any further importation of offsite waste to Hanford. Your mission is to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford, not to add more contamination to this problem. And please do not let it be moved through Portland, where any number of disasters could happen.

Thank you,

Krissy Durden

portland, OR

E-0002

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: TFC10SPRO@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2003 1:35 PM
To: HSWEIS@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Site

Mr Collins,

- 1| Do not let more shipments of radioactive waste come to Hanford. It is not capable of taking these shipments. It is
2| too dangerous to the environment being so close to the Columbia River. Improper storage of such waste can leak
3| and eventually contaminate this great river. It is also dangerous to transport these shipments on our highways.
No more of the nations radioactive waste to Hanford!!

Sincerely,

Tom Caldwell

E-0003

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Gary Montgomery [gmontg@jps.net]
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2003 3:50 PM
To: hswais@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Nuclear Plant

Michael Collins

Dear Sir...

- 1 | I have been informed that the US government is considering dumping nuclear waste from around the country at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation. I don't think this is a good idea at all. First, the nuclear waste and pollution that already exists, hasn't been dealt with at Hanford yet to my satisfaction. Second, the danger of further contamination at Hanford where the nuclear waste can
- 2 | gets into the water in the Eastern Washington area, with who knows what effects on the people and the environment. Third, the danger of hauling the nuclear waste across the country with the
- 3 | potential of accident and terrorist attack is too great.

I think you should rethink the problem and come up with a better solution.

Yours truly,

Gary Montgomery

E-0004

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Don Christine [don_christine@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2003 8:39 PM
To: hswais@rl.gov
Subject: Please stop the importing of radioactive waste

Mr. Michael Collins -

- 1 | I am a concerned citizen, and am writing this in an effort to get Hanford to stop the importation of radioactive waste.

Thank you,

Don Christine
2318 223rd CT NE
Sammamish, WA 98074

Add photos to your messages with MSN 8. Get 2 months FREE*.

<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/featuredemail>

E-0005

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: patty c [patpatking@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2003 7:50 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Site

- 1** | I am writing to express my concern over the shipping of nuclear waste for dumping at the Hanford site. I ask that you stop this practice until further studies can be completed.
Thank You for your consideration.
Patricia Christensen

E-0006

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: desi666@hindunet.com
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2003 8:48 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: comments Hanford SW EIS

Mr. Michael Collins
U.S Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550, A6-38
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Michael Collins,

- 1** | The US DOE has failed to properly address the human health & environmental impact of adding radioactive waste to Hanford in its Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement (SW EIS).
- 2** | PLEASE do not import any offsite waste to Hanford. The radioactive mess needs to be cleaned up as its already contaminating the Columbia River.
- Billions of tax payer dollars (not the nuclear industry's money!) are being spent to cleanup up the radioactive mess at Hanford. Why would we risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater?

Sincerely,

Ravi Grover
PO Box 802103
Chicago, Illinois 60680-2103

E-0007

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Sue Borroff [squeenor@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 06, 2003 7:47 AM
To: hswais@rl.gov
Subject: Radioactive Waste

Michael Collins:

1 | No more importation of radioactive waste to Hanford!!!!

Sue Borroff

E-0008

From: Eileen Newman [mailto:eileen14800@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 22, 2003 3:52 PM
To: yvonne_t_sherman@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford

Hi!

I am very concerned about the Hanford site.

1 | Documented activities at Hanford have already polluted
the Columbia River with radioactive materials,
endangering the health of humans and wildlife. Also,
2 | movement of radioactive materials endanger the
population along I-5 and I-84 in the Oregon region, by
3 | bringing radioactive materials close to vehicles,
school, and communities.

3 | I feel distressed when I hear that the government is
wanting to (and probably has) brought more radioactive materials to Hanford. I thought the goal
was to clean it all up and return the NW USA to health and safety.

- Eileen Newman
Hillsboro, Oregon

"To meet hate with retaliatory hate would do nothing but intensify the existence of evil in the universe. Hate begets hate; violence begets violence; toughness begets a greater toughness. We must meet the forces of hate with the power of love..." - Martin Luther King

Eileen Newman
eileen14800@yahoo.com

E-0009

From: Colleen Snull [\[mailto:colleensnull@earthlink.net\]](mailto:colleensnull@earthlink.net)
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2003 1:34 PM
To: yvonne_t_sherman@RL.gov
Subject: Hanford Clean-up / please protect public health

Dear Yvonne Sherman,

1 | I am writing to express my GREAT concern about the Hanford Clean up site and news of further contamination by accepting more nuclear waste from other locations.

Can the public safely assume government agencies will appropriately represent and protect their interests in longterm health and the viability of Washington state?

2 | I would like to think this is the case, but at this point I SERIOUSLY doubt the people's interests are being counted (even if they have a chance to be "heard"), especially when "inconvenient" to big business short-term profits, and energy industry elites that have apparently paid off our "democratically elected" administration and Congress. It is clear that there is so much corruption in our government and in particular this industry—the burden of proof has shifted to administrators like yourself to PROVE to the American people we can TRUST those agencies that are tasked with PROTECTING human health, the environment, our natural resources, OUR future.

Thank you for not compromising the public's interest for yet another short-sighted, faceless, unaccountable industry.

Sincerely,
-Colleen

Colleen Whitten Snull
1419 N 53rd St
Seattle, WA 98103

E-0010

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: brasiliapilot@yahoo.com
Sent: Tuesday, May 06, 2003 8:25 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford SW EIS comments

Mr. Michael Collins
U.S Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550, A6-38
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Michael Collins,

- 1** | As a concerned citizen of Washington, I felt compelled to write a letter in response to the contaminated mess of Hanford, and the plans of the US Department of Energy to add MORE waste to the problem. The USDOE is proposing a doubling of the amount of waste stored at Hanford; this is completely unacceptable. Why, in an area that continues to absorb billions of dollars in taxpayer money for cleanup, would we want to add MORE nuclear/chemical waste? Its not usually a good idea to drive your car through a mudpuddle after you wash it, but this seems to be the policy of the USDOE. Washington is a beautiful place, a treasure of geologic beauty and incredible wildlife. Please treat Washington with the respect a national treasure deserves.....stop the trashing of our state.....NOW. Enforce and follow the guidelines/goals previously established for cleanup of the site. And please encourage the USDOE to explore other safe options for storage of this waste... The healthy future of our state depends on it.
- 2** |
- 3** |

Sincerely,

Mike Rainville
S. 1728 Lincoln
Spokane, Washington 99203

E-0011

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Jlongley1@cs.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 07, 2003 11:19 AM
To: hsweis@RL.gov
Subject: Hanford waste

To Michael Collins:

- 1** | I am adamantly opposed to adding more radioactive waste to Hanford. This is ridiculous, given the amazing cleanup task ahead of us with what we have now.

Jeanne Longley

Jeanne Longley
Alethia Consulting
Workable Processes in a World That Works
503-286-2637

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: jb4juddcreek@webtv.net
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2003 9:37 AM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford SW EIS comments

Mr. Michael Collins
U.S Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550, A6-38
Richland, WA 99352

Dear Mr. Michael Collins,

1 | I urge you to choose not to import any off-site waste to Hanford. This new EIS still does not
2 | adequately address risks to all communities along transportation routes, specifically the risks from
3&4 | dangerous "transuranic wastes." Accidents can happen. Two other questions: why are
5 | groundwater monitors MILES AWAY FROM the burial vault?.. & why isn't there a "just clean up
6 | Hanford, w/o imports" option? PLEASE! NO import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford
for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches-period.I would appreciate a
response to my comments...

THANKS. ^..^

Sincerely,

John Browne
20929 111th AV SW
Vashon Island, Washington 98070-6467

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Kevin J Miller [milk@harbornet.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2003 8:58 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: importing

Dear Department of Energy:

- 1** | Please understand how opposed people are to the trucking of dangerous waste to Hanford. We are vehemently against this unwise, unsafe, and unprecedented dumping. If the waste itself were not horrific enough, the careless pit dumping of it in proximity to the Columbia is beyond on sense of reason or integrity.

On behalf of my children and their children, this madness must stop.

Yours,

Kevin Miller
2511 N. McCarver St.
Tacoma, Wa 98403

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Bill and/or Carole Woods [woods@sinclair.net]
Sent: Friday, May 09, 2003 2:32 PM
To: hsweis@RL.gov
Subject: nuclear waste imports



MichaelCollins.doc

We've attached our comments regarding the proposed shipments of nuclear waste to Hanford.

Po Box 308
Belfair, WA 98528
May 9, 2003

Michael Collins
Hsweis@rl.gov

Dear Mr. Collins:

- 1 | We must object strongly to the importation of more nuclear waste to our state. Both the Department of Energy and its various contractors have shown themselves unwilling or unable to prevent nuclear waste leaking into the soil and thence into the Columbia River.
- 2 | Moreover, we have cousins, who grew up downwind of Hanford during the green run, dying of thyroid cancer.

Our state has done, and suffered, far more than its share to create our nuclear weapons. It is time to think of the innocent Americans we have harmed, to protect ourselves. Good intentions do not excuse continued negligence and damage, especially to children who happen to live in Spokane or play in the lower Columbia River.

- 3 | We understand the 70,000 truck loads of nuclear waste our government wants to ship to Hanford will deliver the equivalent of over 100 full-body x-rays per hour to those they pass on our freeways. We're certain it would be illegal for us to do that to unsuspecting citizens. We don't think the government should be allowed to do it either. We also
- 4 | understand this nuclear waste will be put in 'unlined trenches'. That's a fancy term for digging a hole and pouring it in! It would be illegal for us to do that with household waste. Again, we don't think the government should be allowed to do it.

- 5 | The whole point of the government our founding fathers designed for us was to give the people the right to protect themselves from the excesses of government. We think this is an example of just those sort of excesses. When our government recklessly harms our land and us, it resembles those against whom it claims to defend us. Please, do not treat us as the dictators we despise treat their people.

Sincerely,
Bill & Carole Woods
Woods@sinclair.net
Tahuya, WA

E-0015

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: barebonesart [barebonesart@attbi.com]
Sent: Monday, May 12, 2003 2:46 PM
To: HSWAIS@rl.gov
Subject: Dumping

Dear Mr. Collins,

- 1** | I cannot attend the meeting Tuesday evening, but would like to register my opinion against the dumping of further radioactive materials at Hanford. The water of the Columbia Basin is already in danger of extreme contamination, it makes little sense to increase that danger. Please see that not only the proposed dumping does not take place, but that the existing mess is cleaned up.

On behalf of those of us who live downstream,

Sharri LaPierre
17002 NE 50th Avenue
Vancouver, WA 98686
360 574-3730

E-0016

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Anne Johnston [anniebj@seanet.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 13, 2003 2:39 AM
To: hswais@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford waste

- 1** | Dear Mike Collins. As a citizen of Washington State I want to protest the idea of sending any more radioactive waste to Hanford. The D.O.E. needs to live up to the tri-party agreement first of all, and protect the soil and water from the waste that is already there. We will not allow you to make our State a national dump. Sincerely, Anne Johnston

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Peter Rimbos [primbos@attbi.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2003 9:11 AM
To: hsweis@RL.gov
Subject: REVISED DRAFT SW EIS--HANFORD

Michael Collins
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550
A6-38
Richland, WA 99352

Mr. Collins,

We are writing you today because we are concerned with cleanup activities at Hanford in our home state. We are very concerned with the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) proposal to double the amount of radioactive waste buried in unlined soil trenches at Hanford. We believe DOE has failed to adequately address the human health and environmental impacts of adding this radioactive waste to Hanford in its *Revised Draft Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement* (EIS). We urge you not to import any offsite waste to Hanford. Rather, we urge you to stick to your mission to clean up the huge radioactive mess already contaminating the Columbia River at Hanford and not to add any more contamination to this problem.

We believe the revised EIS human health and environmental impact analyses are lacking as follows:

- 1
- There should be a complete inventory and classification of all wastes before DOE can assess the impacts of adding even more waste to Hanford.
 - There will be an increase in contaminated groundwater that flows to the Columbia River by dumping more new radioactive and chemical waste. If the groundwater is allowed to become contaminated, any possibility of the public enjoying a safe and usable Hanford Reach will be eliminated.
 - There is not an adequate assessment of risks to all communities along transportation routes.
 - There is not actual timeline given for lining and monitoring the burial trenches for radioactive waste. These burial grounds must be lined immediately.
 - The "no action" alternative considers stopping all cleanup at Hanford—that is not an alternative!

We don't understand why, when we are spending billions of dollars to clean up radioactive waste at Hanford, we would want to risk adding more waste to the already contaminated soil and groundwater. We request DOE reconsider all the impacts to our region before making a decision based on the faulty analyses contained in the revised EIS, which is still not responsive to citizen concerns. We urgently request DOE stop all future import of radioactive and chemical wastes to Hanford for burial and stop burying radioactive waste in unlined soil trenches.

We request our comments be placed in the Public record. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Peter and Naomi Rimbos
19711 241st Ave SE
Maple Valley, WA 98038-8926
primbos@attbi.com

E-0018

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Loudiana [loudiana@attbi.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2003 8:33 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford

- 1** | STOP further import of radioactive waste to this state and Hanford. Let other states deal with their own wastes. Washington is too beautiful to continue to be a dumping ground. What goes around comes around. There is no infallibility when it comes to man. We make far too many mistakes or poor decisions before we look into future consequences especially when it comes to the environment.
- 2** |

E-0019

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Allyn Boldt [a.boldt@worldnet.att.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2003 2:22 PM
To: hsweis@RL.gov
Subject: HSW-EIS Comments



ALB HSW-EIS
comments.doc

Attached as a Word file are my comments on the draft HSW-EIS.

Hard copy is in the mail to Michael Collins.

E-0019 (contd)

Date: May 15, 2003

To: Michael Collins
HSW EIS Document Manager
Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy, A6-38
Post Office Box 550
Richland, WA 99352-0550

Subject: Comments on the Revised Draft Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program
Environmental Impact Statement Richland, Washington

- References: 1) DOE/EIS0286D2, *Revised Draft Hanford Site Solid (Radioactive and Hazardous) Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement Richland*, U.S. Department of Energy Richland Operations Office, Richland Washington.
- 2) RPP-12416, 2002, *River Protection Project Target Baseline, Rev. 1*, CH2M HILL Hanford Group, Inc, Richland, Washington, December.
- 3) RPP-13678, 2003, *Integrated Mission Acceleration Plan, Rev 0*, CH2M HILL Hanford Group, Inc, Richland, Washington, March.

The U.S. Department of Energy (USDOE) has requested public comments on the Draft Hanford Site Solid Waste Program Environmental Impact Statement (HSW-EIS), reference 1. This letter provides comments on the draft.

1

The draft HSW-EIS is inadequate for defining the environmental impacts of the Immobilized Low Activity Waste (ILAW) produced by the tank waste treatment program in the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP).

1) The draft HSW-EIS uses a dated, obsolete value of 211,000 cubic meters for the ILAW volume. Reference 2 provides LAW vitrification plant feed inventories that result in 250,000 cubic meters of ILAW borosilicate glass.

2) The draft HSW-EIS (Reference 1) states that WTP wastes are not applicable to lower and upper bound waste volumes (Sections 3.3 and C.5). References 2 and 3 identify supplemental treatment technologies of containerized grout, steam reformation, and bulk vitrification that may treat up to 80 percent of the tank wastes. Approximate volumes of alternate ILAW forms containing 100 percent of the tank waste inventory and pretreatment chemicals are:

2

ILAW Form	Volume, cubic meters
None – All High Level Waste	0
Iron Phosphate Glass	125,000
HSW-EIS	211,000
Borosilicate Glass	250,000
Stabilized Steam Reformation	600,000
Containerized Grout	750,000
Bulk Vitrification	1,000,000

The bulk vitrification volume of 1,000,000 cubic meters results from macroencapsulation of the ILAW melters in grout (Reference 1, Section 5.3.2.4). During melter operation, volatile radionuclides such as technetium and iodine are volatilized and condense in cooler areas of the melter. The condensed radionuclides have a higher leach rate than radionuclides encapsulated in the glass. The macroencapsulation of the melters in grout is an attempt to reduce the leach rate of radionuclides. The grout in the 1,000,000 cubic meters of emplaced ILAW is estimated at 1,000,000 metric tons and should be included in impacts and resources committed.

- 2** | The draft HSW-EIS gives the total solid waste disposal volume as 754,727 cubic meters Lower Bound and 1,095,409 cubic meters Upper Bound (Reference 1, Table C.1). The correct values with ILAW alternate waste forms should be 545,000 cubic meters Lower Bound and 1,900,000 cubic meters Upper Bound. The ILAW has a potential range of 0 to 65 percent of the total disposed solid wastes.
- 3** | 3) The draft HSW-EIS has failed to include as a waste source the largest single contributor to groundwater contamination. The excluded source term is the packaged WTP salt waste from the Liquid Effluent Treatment Facility (LETf) (Reference 3, page 4-39). WTP process condensates containing technetium and iodine are treated in LETf and soluble salts removed as a solid salt and packaged for disposal. All the WTP processes produce process condensate and scrubber solutions treated by the LETf. The quantity for each process or supplemental technology is a function of the ILAW process conditions and the flowsheet for process condensate treatment. Some of the processes may result in exceeding the regulatory limit for groundwater radiation exposure.
- 4** | 4) The draft HSW-EIS has failed to evaluate the inventory and environmental impact of hazardous chemicals and has evaluated radionuclides only. The HSW-EIS should provide projected hazardous or dangerous waste inventories. Effective December 8, 2003, uranium will have a standard of 0.03 mg/L, based on chemical toxicity that is more restrictive than the radiological dose standard. The containerized grout supplemental technology may result in ground water concentrations of nitrate and nitrite greater than the regulatory limit. Evaluation of uranium, nitrate, nitrite, and other applicable hazardous or dangerous component concentrations in the groundwater should be provided in addition to uranium contribution to the calculated dose.
- 5** | 5) The draft HSW-EIS has failed to provide calculated groundwater concentrations at the regulatory point of compliance (disposal unit boundary or 100 meters down gradient). The draft HSW-EIS provides calculated groundwater concentrations at 1,000 meters down gradient and in the Columbia River. The 1,000 meter and Columbia River concentrations are significantly lower than the regulatory point of compliance values would be.
- 6** | The draft HSW-EIS should be revised using data developed for the Tank Retrieval and Closure Environmental Impact Statement and address the comments above.

Thank you,

Allyn Boldt

1019 S. Irby St.
Kennewick, WA 99338

E-0020

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Jeanie Birchall [idajeanne@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2003 7:24 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford

Dear Mr. Collins,

1 | I cannot imagine why and how it is even being considered to have more radioactive waste delivered to Hanford. This site is already the most contaminated site in our nation. And has been for quite some time! Please put a stop to this and let's clean up Hanford first.

Sincerely,

Jeanie Birchall

E-0021

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Teresa Brain [tbrain@eoni.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 18, 2003 1:00 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford: written comment

I attended the meeting in La Grande and I would like to submit the following written comment.

- 1 | I am concerned about the latest draft for dealing with the hazardous waste at Hanford. I do not
 - 2 | think we should be accepting any additional wastes until what is already at Hanford is cleaned
 - 3 | up and stored safely. In addition, the plans for transporting waste to Hanford did not adequately
- insure safety as it journeys through our communities. I am especially disturbed with the short comment period. The draft is far too large to digest and comment on in the short time allowed. Why not extend the comment period so that it can be properly analyzed? This is far too important (and potentially dangerous) an issue to be rushed.

Thank you

Teresa Brain
La Grande, Oregon 97850
541.963.3041

E-0022

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Karen [mitzner@spiritone.com]
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2003 5:17 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford tragedy

- 1 | I am deeply distressed by the state of the Hanford nuclear waste dump. I am also appalled by the plans the DOE
 - 2 | has to import even more—70,000 truckloads of nuclear waste—to the Hanford storage site. I am a cancer survivor
 - 3 | and find the behavior of the DOE and the Bush administration reprehensible. This site is leaking radioactive and
- other toxic carcinogens into ground water and the Columbia River, putting even more people at risk for cancer. Shame on you. Clean up Hanford! Do not import even more waste to this site.
- Karen Mitzner
136 SWE 63rd Ave.
Portland OR 97215

E-0023

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Ascension1 [ascension1@hiphopsite.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2003 6:19 PM
To: hsweis
Subject: stop shipments of nuclear waste

Dear Michael Collins,

- 1** | I am writing in opposition to the plan to ship 70,000 plus truckloads of waste into Hanford. This is a highly dangerous plan, and for all reasons of sanity and humanity, it must be stopped now! Thank you for your time.

David McGraw
Seattle

E-0024

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Barb and Elliott [barbnel.woodward@verizon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2003 10:43 AM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford

Dear Mr. Collins:

- 1** | I've just found out more about the DOE's continuing plans to store nuclear waste at Hanford. It seems to me that Hanford has enough problems with its own cleanup - which continues to be stalled. I understand that a judge has at least temporarily stopped the storage, but it's not the final word.
- 2** | Please do whatever you can to STOP any further storage at Hanford, and push continued cleanup there.
- 3** | We've already been shown that carelessness is common and I see no reason why I should assume it will get any better. It doesn't take a genius to see that, with the Columbia River so near, and with the contamination that's already occurring, we don't need further dumping.

Thanks for your help!
Barb Woodward

E-0025

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Cathy Zheutlin [rest@spiritone.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2003 1:23 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: radioactive waste

1 | It is unsafe, and therefore unwise to ship 70,000 truckloads of of
radioactive waste to Hanford, which is ALREADY leaking radioactive waste

The government needs to focus on cleaning up Hanford, not importing more toxic waste which poses the threat of accidents on the highways, and intensified toxic leaks in Hanford. Sincerely, Cathy Zheutlin, Portland, Oregon

E-0026

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Revelyn Rawdin [rawdinmorris@juno.com]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2003 1:09 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: eis comment period

Michael Collins

Re: USDOE Solid Waste EIS and the lack of time for adequate review.

1 | The NEPA requires adequate time for the public to read AND assimilate the information written in
any EIS. Your job is to provide adequate time for the public and agencies to read and respond to
specifics within the document. Thirty days is NOT adequate for a 3000 page document. You have
2 | a responsibility that goes beyond your job description to ensure that Hanford is cleaned up.

3 | Hanford is more than just a nuclear waste disposal location. It is a permanent reminder for
generations to come of human irresponsibility, lack of forethought and planning AND most
importantly lack of responsibility to clean up the messes we have created. The end result is the
long-term poisoning of life and water sources within two states and hundreds of mile radius. This
is a reality that must change.

Some of the faults in this EIS are:

- 4 | No analysis of long term impacts to groundwater, the ecosystem, public health or the Columbia
- 5 | River. The EIS states it uses the CRCIA yet it is not in alignment with the minimum requirements
- 6 | of CRCIA. The EIS fails to assess and disclose the impacts to groundwater under the waste site.
- 7 | It fails to address hazardous waste disposal. It fails to address "soil caps" and lateral movement
- 8 | of water and waste under the soil caps.
- 9 | It fails to disclose the impacts of hazardous chemical waste buried with radioactive waste.
- 10 | It fails to assess and disclose risks to the public on all transportation routes.

Revelyn Rawdin

E-0027

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Morgan and Connie Pope [popemdcg@teleport.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 24, 2003 10:03 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hauling of Nuclear Waste to Hanford

Dear Mr. Collins:

1

We would like to add our voices to those who are asking that no nuclear waste be hauled to Hanford. The dangers and problems that hauling would bring to an already terrible situation are not justifiable. Hauling the nuclear waste endangers more people and areas. The plain truth is that there is no satisfactory disposal of nuclear waste. So hauling it is adding more risk to an already terribly risky situation.

Thank you.

Morgan and Constance Pope

E-0028

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: makalajimu@hotmail.com
Sent: Sunday, May 25, 2003 6:59 PM
To: HSWEIS@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Solid Waste EIS Comments

The following comments were sent from the Hanford Solid Waste EIS Comments form.

Date: May 25, 2003 05:56:20 PM
Name: Jim McCullough
Phone: 2067227870
Street Address: 5132 S. Farrar
City, State Zip: Seattle, WA 98118
Email Address: makalajimu@hotmail.com

1

Comments: I strongly do not want waste from other states being sent to Hanford and/or any other locations in our state, Washington.

E-0029

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: sugaharareiko@hotmail.com
Sent: Sunday, May 25, 2003 7:00 PM
To: HSWEIS@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Solid Waste EIS Comments

The following comments were sent from the Hanford Solid Waste EIS Comments form.

Date: May 25, 2003 05:56:20 PM
Name: Reiko McCullough
Phone: 2067227870
Street Address: 5132 S. Farrar
City, State Zip: Seattle, WA 98118
Email Address: sugaharareiko@hotmail.com

1 | Comments: I very strongly do not want waste from other states being sent to Hanford.

E-0030

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: DOTTY DALE [dotty@nas.com]
Sent: Monday, May 26, 2003 8:50 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford waste

Dear Michael Collins,

1 | As a resident of Washington, I urgently request that you prevent any more nuclear waste coming to Hanford.

Residents of our state are already living with the negative health results of too much nuclear in their air and water and ground.

Thank you for your careful consideration of this highly moral problem.

Sincerely, Dorothy A Dale
Bellingham, WA

E-0031

This e-mail was submitted twice.
See the original letter at L-0031.

E-0032

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: TRWaggener@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2003 6:50 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford DOE Plan

- 1** | I am heartily opposed to the DOE plan for bringing in more waste into Hanford. There is substantial waste there today, which needs to be cleaned up and properly treated and stored. The Columbia River and the area around Hanford are already at grave risk. We do not need more waste, we do need more cleanup.

Thank you for your attention,

Thomas R. Waggener
1027 SW 174th Street
Normandy Park, WA 98166

E-0033

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Linda Hayes [lindahayes@bainbridge.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2003 3:29 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov

- 1** | Please stop further import of radioactive waste. Thanks for doing a responsible job.

Linda Hayes
5032 Rockaway Beach R.
Bainbridge Is. WA 98110

E-0034

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: McKee [dmckee@Bigfoot.com]
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2003 12:30 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford

To Whom It May Concern,

1 We are Washington State residents who are concerned about the use of Hanford as a nuclear waste dump. We wish to see all dumping of nuclear waste stopped on the Hanford Reserve, and continued cleanup of past activity.

Hanford is a poor choice as a dump site primarily because of its proximity to the Columbia River. Washington State has provided waste storage long enough. Let some other state take the responsibility from now on.

Thank you,

Don and Denise McKee
4726 51st Place SW
Seattle, WA 98116

E-0035

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Steve Shaiman [steve@shaiman.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 04, 2003 7:03 PM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Radioactive Waste Dump

Dear Mr. Michael Collins,

1 I'm not going to read a 3000-page report and I suspect that you haven't done so either. What I have read about the dumping of 70,000 truckloads of radioactive and hazardous waste in unlined soil trenches at Hanford concerns me deeply. Of special concern is a lack of possible alternatives with associated cost and benefits analysis. I am already concerned about the potential ground water contamination of the Columbia River from the existing conditions at Hanford. The current waste plan raises the possibility of this potential problem of contamination almost to a certainty, maybe not in my lifetime, maybe not in yours, but surely during my children or their children's lives. Once the contamination takes place its too late, pretty much forever!

As our world shrinks our efforts to maintain our environment needs to increase not dwindle away in hopelessness. Unless you believe we need to add the criteria that the human race be selected biologically for radiation resistance, rationally it should be difficult for you to disagree. The time has come to draw the line and help the people of this country and the world have a healthy & environmentally safe future.

2 Finally, as a long-term resident of the Northwest I can't help but be confused by how this plan contributes to the ongoing cleanup at Hanford. I wonder why we can't take care of our outstanding problems at Hanford before adding to them. If the truth is that there is no intent to ever clean up Hanford please make this clear. If we're willing to sacrifice the Columbia River as part of the Northwest's contribution to the national welfare, someone needs to simply say so, so the people have an opportunity to comment on these plans.

Thanks for your time,
Steve Shaiman
4334 NE 43rd Street
Seattle, Washington 98105-5104

E-0036

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Andrea Finley [afinley@u.washington.edu]
Sent: Thursday, June 05, 2003 9:13 AM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: HANFORD WASTE

1 | I urge you as a concerned citizen of the State of Washington to put an immediate stop to further import of radioactive waste to Hanford!

Ande Finley (206) 616-8478
Fiscal Specialist Supervisor (206) 685-8100 FAX
Dept. of Neurology
HSB RR-640; Box 356465
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-6465

E-0037

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Alan Conroy [calan1@qwest.net]
Sent: Thursday, June 05, 2003 11:56 AM
To: hsweis@RL.gov
Subject: Hanford

Mr. Michael Collins,

1 | I am emailing you to voice my concerns about the planned shipment of 70,000 truckloads of waste to Hanford. I do not believe it makes sense to do this when the current waste is leaking into the soil and water table. I want the DOE to fulfill its previous commitments to clean up Hanford before it makes the situation even worse. If the DOE can clean up and vitrify the existing Hanford waste, I will have far less concern about shipping more waste. Until that time, I am most assuredly opposed to any action that involves shipping more waste to Hanford.

Most sincerely,

Alan Conroy
alan1@conroyhome.net
<http://www.conroyhome.net/alan>

E-0038

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: patty.singer@worldnet.att.net
Sent: Sunday, June 08, 2003 5:34 PM
To: HSWEIS@rl.gov
Subject: Hanford Solid Waste EIS Comments

The following comments were sent from the Hanford Solid Waste EIS Comments form.

Date: June 8, 2003 04:21:34 PM
Name: Patricia K. Singer
Phone: 206-898-2202
Street Address: 1071 4th Ave So #102
City, State Zip: Edmonds, WA 98020
Email Address: patty.singer@worldnet.att.net

1 | **Comments:** I believe we have an opportunity this time to do the right thing. It seems that in the past our country has often taken the easiest and least expensive approach to the clean up of radioactive and chemical waste. It's time for us to take a stand and show our country that we can store radioactive and chemical waste safely, that we can halt groundwater contamination, that we can stop transporting more radioactive waste until we can safely store our existing waste. We have an opportunity and a responsibility to make our land a safe place to live and work in. In making your decisions, please ask yourself how you would feel if your family, your grandchildren, relatives or friends had to live in an area where radioactive waste had contaminated the soil and the water. We need to start taking environmental issues more personally. I was born in Walla Walla in 1947, so I know how people can be affected by these kinds of decisions. Please, take this opportunity to make the right decisions by considering the impact on human life, our animals, our water supply and our soil. I believe we can make our world a better place, but each of us needs to have the courage to do the right thing. Patty Singer

2 |

E-0039

^Solid Waste EIS - DOE

From: Kim Fackler [kfackler@drizzle.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2003 6:57 AM
To: hsweis@rl.gov
Subject: Don't dump more waste!

1 & 2 | Michael Collins,
3 | Don't dump more waste in Hanford. It's already leaking. Cleanup must be our top priority.
Cleanup is impossible if additional waste keeps increasing the problem. Even considering adding more waste to this polluted site is a disgrace.

Kim Fackler